

**AGENCY.**  
JAMES M. REMOND, Postmaster at Tarboro', is Agent for this paper, for subscription and the adjoining counties. Mr. R. will take pleasure in receiving new subscribers and receiving for any money due us in that section.

JAMES M. REMOND, Postmaster at Tarboro', is Agent for this paper, for subscription and the adjoining counties. Mr. R. will take pleasure in receiving new subscribers and receiving for any money due us in that section.

Mr. JAMES BURCH is our authorized agent to make collections due the "Journal" office in this town and county.

**REMOVAL.**  
The "Journal" printing office has been removed to the second story of the building, in which it has heretofore been carried on. Entrance on Princess street, opposite the Bank of the State.

The Editor's office is now on Princess street, 2d door from the corner.

Entrance to printing office third door from the corner.

**SOUTH CAROLINA AND RAIL ROADS.**—A writer in the Charleston Mercury, who signs himself AKTI-DENT, has taken strong grounds against the State's again participating in the construction of Rail Roads. Well, with this, as a North Carolinian, we have nothing properly to do. We are, however, pleased to see that this writer, in speaking of the various schemes projected, thinks that the Manchester Road will carry twice as many passengers as any of the other routes. We are glad that a Charlestonian makes even this admission. We believe that the Wilmington & Manchester Road will carry at least eight times as many passengers per mile as any of the other Roads. From calculations which we have made, and we have taken some pains in making them, we feel assured that the through travel, that is, the great Northern and Southern travel, will, in less than six months after the completion of the work, be at least 50 passengers per day each way. Beyond this, we have every reason to believe that the local travel will equal that on any of the Roads which the Mercury's correspondent enumerates. Indeed, there is no man who knows anything about the geography of the United States, and who is at all acquainted with the Rail Road question, as it now exists, and who looks at the Manchester route, but must admit that if there is any scheme of this kind in all the Southern country that can be profitable, it must, from the very force of things, be the Wilmington & Manchester Rail Road. We, the individuals along the line of this contemplated project, have shown our faith in this scheme, by all ready putting up about \$600,000 of the stock.

**WHAT WILL THE WHIGS DO?**—We venture to make the assertion that the sensible, far-seeing portion of the Whig party regret that they have a majority in the next House of Representatives, near about as much as do the Democrats. What will they do? After having denounced the war in every shape and form—after having, through their organs, poured out on the head of Mr. Polk's administration every species of abuse for conducting the war as it has been conducted, they now suddenly, and, we apprehend, contrary to their calculations, find themselves holding the reins of power, so far as the lower branch of Congress is concerned. What will they do with this power? In the language of an able New England contemporary, the New Haven (Conn.) Register, "What is their position? The federal presses in New England have condemned the war, its origin and objects—denounced the Administration for its reasonable prosecution of it—and very boldly assert that the means for its continuance should be withheld by Congress! And having committed themselves to such a policy, we shall now see whether they are really ready for the moral treason they profess; whether they will dare oppose by their votes the vigorous prosecution of the war, when the responsibility of the matter rests on their own shoulders? If they have been honest in their denunciations, they will carry them into practice; they will declare by their votes, that the injustice we have received from Mexico was right; that the murder and imprisonment of American citizens was right; that the invasion of one of the United States, by Mexico, with the avowed purpose of subjugation and slaughter, was right—and that resistance by our Government, which is bound to protect each State from foreign invasion, was wrong! they will vote to withhold supplies from our troops now in the field—and compel their return, in the midst of a series of successful victories, leaving perforce triumphant, and Mexican injustice unatoned for. They will do these things, if they are honest in the abuse which they have showered without stint upon President Polk and the democratic party. If they should take this course, it will prove to all that they are the Anti-American party, and hurry them to a political doom which they are by no means anxious or ready for: for the country will not sustain a party that should take such ground in any controversy with a foreign power—much less in this, where we are so manifestly in the right. If they do not take the promised course, they will stand convicted of hypocrisy—of trifling with the interests and honor of the country—of a factious opposition to their Government, in time of war—and stand exposed, traitors without courage, demagogues, of the weakest and most contemptible stamp. They must impale themselves on either horn of the dilemma; and we have no doubt the leaders of that party would gladly escape from the responsibility of present legislation, by the loss of power which has so inopportunistically fallen to the whig party.

**U. S. TREASURY.**—We see it stated in a letter of one of the Washington City correspondents of the New York papers, that all of the eighteen million loan has been paid in with the exception of four millions, and that there is now in the Treasury about two millions of dollars, which sum, together with the current receipts, it is supposed will be amply sufficient to meet the current expenses of Government until the middle of December, when Congress can take the matter into consideration.

**DASTARDLY.**—Of all the mean, dastardly acts, of which Santa Anna has been guilty, we think that of his turning loose from the prisons of the capital fourteen or fifteen hundred felons, and arming them with knives, for the express purpose of carrying on the work of assassination upon the American soldiery, is decidedly the most dastardly and barbarian of them all. We do hope that if Gen. Scott, or rather Gen. Quitman, can lay his hands upon these miscreants, he will treat them to an assassin's death—an ignominious death.

**VOLUNTEERING IN THE WEST.**—We do not understand the reasons why our fellow-countrymen in the great valley of the Mississippi should be more patriotic or more war like than we of the old Atlantic States, but, nevertheless, the fact is, that a Regiment of Volunteers be called for from one of the valley States; no sooner is the call made than the Regiment is made up. Such has not been the case, at least, in some of the Southern Atlantic States. Now here is Tennessee, as it appears from the following letter from Major Ringgold, has raised her 31 Regiment, and we learn she is ready to make up another if required. We find the following extract of a letter from Major Ringgold, dated Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 10, and addressed to Gen. Towns, Paymaster General U. S. A., in the Union of Oct. 20th:—

"I proceeded to Louisville, where I met Major Gaines, and was by him informed that the payment of the Nashville Regiment would have to be made by me. I arrived here on Thursday last. The entire regiment was mustered in on Friday, and the payment will be completed to-morrow. Two companies of the regiment are expected to arrive here on Tuesday, on their way to Memphis, and the Governor has expressed a wish to have them paid here. I shall remain a day or two for this purpose, and then proceed to Smithland, where there are two companies of the Kentucky regiment, which I shall likewise pay, and then proceed to Memphis. All the regiments of the last requisition are like this one, Gen. Butler will have a most desirable command. They are a splendid body of volunteers, most of them six feet high. They have elected all their officers by acclamation, and really display a unanimity rarely to be met with in the raw material."

**SANTA ANNA'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.**—We have been not a little amused in reading the address of this would-be Napoleon of the American peninsula. He has resigned the Presidency of that great and glorious republic, once the heritage of the Aztecs, and in tendering his resignation, he takes occasion to inform his countrymen that he has accomplished such wonders in the "tent of field" as, himself being the judge, far outshine the renowned exploits of Bonaparte in the celebrated Italian campaign. He says he has courted death in every shape; that he has been wounded, and that he has had his clothes riddled by the bullets of the "perfidious Yankees." In a word, he tells his unfortunate countrymen, and we suppose some of them will believe him, that he has performed prodigies of valor and generalship, but that fortune was his foe. It is really rich; and what adds to the richness of the whole, is, that he "stretches" that he will continue to fight the "Northern barbarians till either he is numbered with the dead or they have ceased to pollute the "holy" soil of the republic with their impious foot-prints."

Santa Anna is an able and dexterous manager, and we have no doubt that he has written this bombastic tirade with a fair calculation upon the gullibility of his countrymen.

**NEW YORK AND THE WILMOT PROVISION.**—Up to this time, we have watched the course of our brethren of the Democratic party at the North, on the all-important slavery question, with unbounded pleasure. The Democrats of Massachusetts, Connecticut, and Maine, in the most authoritative manner, have given the most unequivocal go-by to the doctrines of Wilmot. More recently the Democratic State Convention of the great State of New York, which assembled at Syracuse to nominate State officers, laid on the table a resolution which had for its object the incorporation of the Wilmot Provision into the political creed of the Democracy of the Empire State. This we looked upon as settling the question. It seems, however, that a portion of the Democrats of that State are not satisfied with the nominations of the Syracuse Convention. Most of our readers are aware that the Democracy of New York is divided into two grand sections, familiarly known as the "Hunkers" and "Barn-burners." The "Hunkers" carried the day in the Convention, and the "Barn-burners" are dissatisfied. The latter propose holding another Convention at Herkimer for the purpose of expressing this dissatisfaction. Now we would not give to this proposed Herkimer Convention such weight, but that we gather from the organs of the "Barn-burners" that its principal object is to rescind the slavery question; in a word, to adopt the Wilmot Provision. This we deplore exceedingly, and do trust that the sensible, right-thinking portion of the party in that great State will frown down this attempt to cast into its ranks a firebrand, that will not only distract and ruin its prospects in New York, but endanger its ascendancy throughout the Union. We did hope, and despite this unfortunate division in New York will still hope, that the Democratic party, from Maine to Texas, would plant itself upon the Missouri Compromise. We know that the Whig party at the North has leagued itself with the Abolitionists, but united upon the compromises of the constitution, we feel assured that the Republican party can and will triumph over the united hosts of Federalists and Abolitionists. We do earnestly hope that the Democrats of New York may be able to unite on this all-important question. Such a union would ensure to the Republican party a triumph in '48, which would even eclipse that of '44. We will not be discouraged. The good sense of the party, and the inherently correct principles of Republicanism, we doubt not will bring all this matter straight before next spring.

**U. S. TREASURY.**—We see it stated in a letter of one of the Washington City correspondents of the New York papers, that all of the eighteen million loan has been paid in with the exception of four millions, and that there is now in the Treasury about two millions of dollars, which sum, together with the current receipts, it is supposed will be amply sufficient to meet the current expenses of Government until the middle of December, when Congress can take the matter into consideration.

**DASTARDLY.**—Of all the mean, dastardly acts, of which Santa Anna has been guilty, we think that of his turning loose from the prisons of the capital fourteen or fifteen hundred felons, and arming them with knives, for the express purpose of carrying on the work of assassination upon the American soldiery, is decidedly the most dastardly and barbarian of them all. We do hope that if Gen. Scott, or rather Gen. Quitman, can lay his hands upon these miscreants, he will treat them to an assassin's death—an ignominious death.

**VOLUNTEERING IN THE WEST.**—We do not understand the reasons why our fellow-countrymen in the great valley of the Mississippi should be more patriotic or more war like than we of the old Atlantic States, but, nevertheless, the fact is, that a Regiment of Volunteers be called for from one of the valley States; no sooner is the call made than the Regiment is made up. Such has not been the case, at least, in some of the Southern Atlantic States. Now here is Tennessee, as it appears from the following letter from Major Ringgold, has raised her 31 Regiment, and we learn she is ready to make up another if required. We find the following extract of a letter from Major Ringgold, dated Nashville, Tenn., Oct. 10, and addressed to Gen. Towns, Paymaster General U. S. A., in the Union of Oct. 20th:—

"I proceeded to Louisville, where I met Major Gaines, and was by him informed that the payment of the Nashville Regiment would have to be made by me. I arrived here on Thursday last. The entire regiment was mustered in on Friday, and the payment will be completed to-morrow. Two companies of the regiment are expected to arrive here on Tuesday, on their way to Memphis, and the Governor has expressed a wish to have them paid here. I shall remain a day or two for this purpose, and then proceed to Smithland, where there are two companies of the Kentucky regiment, which I shall likewise pay, and then proceed to Memphis. All the regiments of the last requisition are like this one, Gen. Butler will have a most desirable command. They are a splendid body of volunteers, most of them six feet high. They have elected all their officers by acclamation, and really display a unanimity rarely to be met with in the raw material."

**OUR RAIL ROAD.**—Several enthusiastic Rail Road Meetings have been held in Wilmington during the past ten days. The very best spirit is awake. The building of the Manchester Road is becoming more and more of a certainty every day. A committee has been at work during the past week, and has made an addition of some \$30,000 to the subscription book. We have no doubt but that the amount which falls to the share of Wilmington will be up in a few days.

At a meeting held at the Masonic Hall on Tuesday night last, the following gentlemen were appointed a committee to represent the town of Wilmington on Saturday next, at Goldsborough, in Wayne county, where there is to be a Rail Road meeting and Barbecue, viz: David Reid, Wm. Hill, Henry Nutt, David Fulton, H. L. Holmes, T. D. Mears, Miles Costin, W. O. Jeffreys, Dr. T. H. Wright, and Gen. Alexander McLean.

**WHO CAN PREDICT THE END?**—Speculation upon the mode and the manner of the termination of the present Mexican war, is being pretty largely indulged in by some of our contemporaries of both parties, and we do not see why we should not put in our card in this grave question as well as others. When, then, will this war be brought to a close? In what manner will it terminate? These are extremely grave and important questions, and from the present posture of affairs, questions that are very difficult to answer. In our estimation, indeed, we know that the war was commenced upon our part from the very necessity of the case. We were forced into the contest. We do not believe, however, that there is a single man in the Union who could have dreamed at the commencement of the contest that at this day it could possibly have assumed the aspect which it now presents. The United States of America declared war for the twofold purpose, as we understand the matter, of repelling a foreign nation who had insolently invaded our soil, and of redressing the many grievances which that nation had heaped upon our country during a series of years. We could not suppose but that the war would, long ere this, have been brought to a close. Wherever the armies of Mexico have attempted to make a stand, they have been met signally and thoroughly whipped. A large portion of the territory of the Republic of Mexico has been in our actual possession during the last twelve months. Had we been fighting any other civilized country on the face of the earth, we would reasonably calculate that she would have sued for peace long ere this. But what is the state of the facts? The United States have offered at every stage of the war to make peace on honorable and fair terms. Up to this time Mexico has utterly, and we might add contemptuously, refused to accede to any of our propositions. We have continually extended to her the olive branch, and she has continually rejected it. What then? At this very moment the American army is in possession of the capital of the country, and still, to all appearances, we are no nearer peace than we were twelve months ago. What are we now to do? We cannot, even were we so disposed, withdraw our troops from Mexico without covering our country with eternal disgrace. But we believe there is no disposition to do this at any rate. What, then, are we to do? This, indeed, is a most difficult question to answer. Instead of attempting to unriddle the matter, we say at once, and we care not who likes or who dislikes it, that we for cutting the Gordian knot with the sword. In other words, and to be plainer, we go for taking possession of the whole country, and, if needs be, of holding on to it too. Mexico in this way can be made to pay the expenses of the whole war. We believe she will not do so otherwise. Indeed, we believe that this will be the result, at any rate. We see no other course left open for the United States. Mexico will not make peace on any honorable or fair terms. What, then, can we do? We, for one, cannot see any course but one open to us, and that is the one we have indicated above, and if Mexico will neither make peace with us nor defend herself, she must take the consequences as the inevitable fate of war. We have no doubt but that in a few years we can bring them to their senses. We must conquer them out and out, if nothing short of this will do. The sooner and the more vigorously we set about the matter the better. If Mexico is entirely satisfied, as her recent conduct would lead us to believe, she has no one but herself to blame, even should the consequences be her total subjugation.

**THE COTTON CROP** is estimated by some of the Southern papers at two million two hundred thousand bales. This is much larger than the estimates made a month ago, and we believe the figure has been raised in consequence of the "picking" having turned out more favorable than was anticipated. We think this estimate beyond the truth, from all the accounts which we have noticed in the papers published in the large cotton growing States.

**AN OLD CALCULATION.**—The Wilmington Journal congratulates itself and its friends that, should the election of next President be thrown into the House of Representatives, "the Democrats will have a decided majority of the States"—and then, to show this, it says, that "of the 27 States that have already voted, 12 have elected Democratic majorities, 12 have returned Whig majorities, and 3 are tied. Two States, Mississippi and Louisiana, have yet to elect, and they will certainly send Democratic delegations."

Admitting the facts, we would like to ask the Observer whether if 3 States out of 29 are tied, and therefore do not vote at all, 14 would not be a decided majority of the remaining 26? We were of this opinion. Perhaps the Observer can cast some light upon the matter which will show a different result. Not so very "old" after all.

**PROPERTY IN NEW YORK.**—The real and personal property in New York city is valued at the enormous sum of \$347,153,308.

**PAID OFF.**—The Encarnacion prisoners were recently paid off at New Orleans. They numbered in all 92 men, and Uncle Sam gave the "boys" nearly \$17,000 for their services.

**DEATH OF LIEUT. JOHN B. BEATTY.**—We regret to learn, from a letter received in this place from Capt. Kirkpatrick of the Cumberland and Bladen Company of N. C. Volunteers, dated at Arista's Mills, near Saltillo, Sept. 19th, that Lieut. John B. Beatty, son of John D. Beatty, Esq., of Bladen county, died at that place on the 13th Sept. Capt. Kirkpatrick mentions that he had been ever since his arrival in Mexico, but no person named Beatty could be traced in the service. Capt. K. had his remains properly enclosed in a tin and wooden coffin, and entrusted to the care of Capt. Balock, of the Yancey Company, to bring to his native place. Capt. Balock was on his return home, having resigned his command.

Capt. Kirkpatrick's company were all well, except Lieut. Dunham, who was sick, but not dangerously, and Duncan Johnson, who had been quite sick, but was going out again. [Fayetteville Observer of last Wednesday]

**YELLOW FEVER IN NEW ORLEANS.**—We see it stated that the Board of Health of the city of New Orleans, has announced that Yellow Fever, as an epidemic, has ceased to exist in the city. The N. O. Delta, in referring to this announcement, holds the following language:—"With all due deference for the opinion of the Board of Health, we must say that we consider their announcement of the total disappearance of the epidemic rather premature. By reference to our columns, it will be seen that there have been 18 interments of yellow fever in the city cemeteries for the 48 hours ending at 6 o'clock last evening, and in the Charity Hospital, during the same period, there have been 13 deaths from that disease."

**THE BLESSINGS OF FREE TRADE.**—For several years past, the Locomotives have continued to set before us the example of England, in adopting Free Trade, as they call it. Now we should like to know if any part of the present prosperity of England is occasioned by this Free Trade system? And if so, what portion of the blessed system, bestowed upon us partially by the Tariff of 1846, may be expected in due time to produce like results in the United States?

**TO ADVERTISE THE FACTS.**—We regret to see the above paragraph, which would suggest to the Observer the fact that England is "blessed" with a large monetary institution called a "National Bank," i. e. the Bank of England, which, perhaps, may account for the "present prosperity" of that country. We do not know, but only throw out the suggestion to the Observer.

**ELECTIONS.**—The full returns from Pennsylvania, gives Shunk (dem.) a majority of about 19,000 votes.

**OUR.**—The full returns from Ohio, gives the Whigs seven majority in the Legislature on joint ballot. This is unfortunate, as a Senator is to be chosen in the place of Mr. Allen, dem.

**AN INCIDENT OF THE LATE BATTLES.**—We know that we have given our readers quite a quantity of war news in our last, as well as in the present, paper, still we think they will not quarrel with us for publishing the following graphic details of a most interesting incident. We find them in the correspondence of the N. O. Delta, from the pen of the witty and ingenious Mustang:—

The following incident evidences the enthusiasm and state of feeling pervading the ranks of the army. On the evening previous to the storming of the castle of Chapultepec, an order was given from headquarters that the 1st and 21st Divisions should furnish storming parties to assault the works. Its formidable appearance, the nature of the ground, and the strength of the force with which it was occupied, in the opinion of the General-in-Chief, required that it should be assaulted by tried and veteran troops. Accordingly, instead of drawing them by detail, it was stated, that if there was enough of volunteers they would be taken. When this was announced, so great was the anxiety that in many instances it had to be decided by lots. In the 21st Infantry, which is attached to the 21st Division, there was a private who was employed by a lieutenant as a cook, and from the nature of his occupation he did not have an opportunity of drawing lots. As soon as he learned of the result, he sought the lieutenant's quarters, and apparently deeply mortified, bitterly complained at his misfortune, as he called it, and implored the lieutenant to let him go with the detachment in the morning, as he had never had a chance. The lieutenant sympathized with him, but told him he had no authority to let him go. The private left the officer's quarters, and nothing more was heard of him until next morning, when the officer was called to his breakfast at a much earlier hour than usual, and has since told me that he was the best cup of coffee and the best breakfast he has enjoyed since he left Puebla. Shortly after the soldier was missing, and nothing more was heard of him until Colonel Riley's Brigade entered the Plaza on the 14th, which was some time after the 1st Brigade, Col. Riley having entered with Gen. Worth, and Gen. Smith with Gen. Quitman.

**FROM OUR PHILADELPHIA CORRESPONDENT.**  
PHILADELPHIA, Oct. 25, 1847.  
Dear Journal: You have the honor of reading my first letter intended for the light; and in criticizing it, I hope you, as well as your numerous, and I hope indulgent readers, will bear this in mind. Your able correspondent J. J. has been called elsewhere, and perhaps it is better that he should be absent from here should drop, than that I should trespass him. But I will do as well as I can: no one can do more.

After George M. Dallas cast his vote for a low tariff, predictions ran very strong that this State would consign all low tariff men to the altar of their next election. That election is over, how signally those predictions have been falsified! There is no use in me at this time recapitulating the vote. You can read it in any of the prints of the day. I may be permitted, however, to give my idea of the reasons why the result was what it was. The high tariff men went on the ground, that in six months after the low tariff went into operation, the wheel of the factory would cease to revolve; the axe of the shipwright would wax rusty; the clock of the mechanic would stop; the mill would mould from the same cause; the coal and iron mines of Pennsylvania would be dormant; and that all the industry of the land would be blighted as with a plague; that the revenue would dwindle so low, that even our mutual and venerable relation, Uncle Sam, would have no occasion for a breeches pocket; that all our money would be dissipated by that rampant animal, John Bull, &c., &c. In fact, that we would be totally ruined. But how has it turned out? Why, almost twice as many tons entered and cleared at Philadelphia this last year as ever did in the same time before; the same in other ports; factories of every description are springing up as if by magic all over the country; iron foundries and smelting establishments appear to be growing spontaneously; shipwrights are in such demand, that in this city \$250 per day has been paid for them; ships have been built almost without number; in fact, everything has become more prosperous under the new tariff than it ever was before. Well, the Whigs gull the people with the cry that a low tariff would ruin the country, and the people have seen for themselves. Why the high tariff men insult not only common sense, but the industrious, intelligent mechanics of this country—I'll tell you: Every one will admit that we have more natural advantages than any one country under heaven. Then if we fear competition, the fault must be our own. We must admit that we lack the power of manufacturing, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve protection. But such a view of the case is absurd, and as I said before, insulting. A mechanic might as well say, that he has a better right to a monopoly of his trade than the farmer has to his soil, or the merchant to his capital, or the manufacturer to his machinery. I say it, having the raw material cheaper than him—fuel cheaper and far plentier than him—we cannot manufacture as cheap as him, we do not deserve